

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME II.]

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1857.

[NUMBER 7.]

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

TERMS.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

All letters must be post-paid.

Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

A NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY PARTY—IS IT NOT PRACTICABLE?

"A national anti-slavery party is a phantom, nothing else. Such a party is an impossibility. An anti-slavery party must, of necessity, be sectional."

[Correspondent of the Liberator.]

Here, again, (as in respect to the construction of the Constitution,) we find a class of abolitionists, intent upon following, implicitly, the lead of the slaveholders! How can it be made to appear that a national anti-slavery party is an impossibility? That it must, of necessity, be sectional? Where did that doctrine come from?

The slavery propagandists have lately croaked themselves hoarse in crying out against their political opponents as being "sectional." They found the Republican party to be supported chiefly at the North, and so they denounced it as being "sectional," as if in forgetfulness of their own fearful approximation to a similar position.

But they did not go quite so far as to pronounce an anti-slavery party to be, of necessity, "sectional." Gov. Wise, in particular, as well as the committees of citizens, in the same State, who ejected Messrs. Underwood and Stannard, appear to have been deeply impressed with the idea that there might prove to be no such "impossibility" in the case. The discovery of that impossibility was reserved for the class of abolitionists who decry all political action, and yet advocate "dissolution" as the grand remedy of slavery.

We repeat the inquiry—How can such an "impossibility" be proved? Or what is the ground of the assumption?

It rests, solely, we apprehend, on the common fallacy, derived, of course, from the slaveholders themselves, that the slaveholders, and they only, constitute "the South,"—that the six millions of non-slaveholding whites, equally with the four millions of colored people, bond

and free, are to be put down as cyphers by the side of the 347,000 slaveholders and their families, amounting, possibly, to a population of one million, five hundred thousand, being about one-fourth part of the white population, or about one seventh part of the entire population, of both colors. Yes! the slaveholders are put down for "the South," and all the rest are counted as nobody.

It will be said that the slaves and free people of color cannot vote, and that a large part of the non-slaveholding whites are in a similar predicament. Be it so. The number of non-slaveholding voters is nevertheless more than double the number of slaveholding voters. Is it an "impossibility" for them to rally on the side of anti-slavery, and against the petty oligarchy that oppresses them?

Non-slaveholders of Kentucky! what say you? Is it impossible for you to vote against the slaveholders? Let us see.

The Census of 1850 puts down the whole number of slaveholders in Kentucky at 38,385

A Note of the compiler, Mr. De Bow, admits that the Census gives as too many, because some of the slaveholders, having slaves in two or more counties, were counted twice or thrice. And we know that many of them are women, and minors, who do not vote.* Nevertheless, we will let the number stand, as above.

The returns of the late Presidential election give as the number of votes cast in Kentucky, as being 139,108

Deducting from this, the whole number of slaveholders, as above, we have the number of non-slaveholding voters, in Kentucky, 100,723

It is not to be presumed that all the slaveholders, or that all the non-slaveholders who were entitled to vote, actually voted. But the proportion of slaveholding absentees from the polls would not be likely to be greater than that of the non-slaveholding absentees. The above proportions, though, doubtless, too favorable for the slaveholders, is near enough for our purpose. And how does it stand? Very nearly 100 non-slaveholders to 38 slaveholders! Is it "impossible" to have an anti-slavery party in Kentucky? What say you, friend Bailey, Editor of the Kentucky News. Do you think so?

* Our own belief, in which we are not singular, is, that the number of slaveholding voters, does not exceed 100,000, or, at most 150,000. In that case, our estimate gives them twice or three times their true number.

Look, next, at the aggregate of all the slave States—

Slaveholders, women and all, by the Census, 347,525
Subject to the same deduction as above stated.

Presidential vote of the slave States in 1856, 1,137,723*

Non-slaveholding votes in the slave States, 790,198

Showing a proportion of about 790 non-slaveholding voters to about 347 slaveholding voters—more than two to one.

What reason, then, is there, for saying that a "national anti-slavery party is a phantom"—that an anti-slavery party, must, of necessity, be "sectional"? Are "anti-slavery" politics so exceedingly popular, at the North, as to warrant the conclusion that they can flourish, nowhere else? Is it quite certain that the non-slaveholders of the South will not be as easily roused to political action against slavery as the non-slaveholders of the North? Are they not quite as deeply interested in the deleterious workings of the slave system?

Non-slaveholders at the North are exceedingly dull of heart to comprehend what business they have to "interfere" with the slave system of the South. They have been taught to believe that the subject of slavery belongs exclusively to the States wherein it exists.—Thus they excuse themselves from joining an anti-slavery party in politics. The most that has, thus far, been got out of them, by all the appeals that have been addressed to them, has been a minority vote to prevent the extension of slavery into the new Territories, which they wish to reserve for the "free labor" of their own children. Not so with the non-slaveholders of the South. It is slavery in the States that most interests and that most troubles them. An "abolition" party, in distinction from a mere "non-extension" party or a "disunion" party, would be the thing best calculated to enlist their co-operation. When Northern abolitionists will show them a fair political rally against slavery in the States, we have no doubt that the movement will find a corresponding response at the South.

The notion that the non-slaveholders of the South cannot be enlisted in a "National Anti-Slavery party" is well nigh equivalent to the idea that slavery cannot be abolished at all.—Nobody expects an universal or even a general

* For these numbers we are indebted to the New-York Tribune of December 19; the vote of South Carolina being put down "by estimate" at 50,000, and all the rest by the returns.

emancipation of the slaves of this country, through isolated acts of manumission by individual slaveholders. Should such a phenomenon be witnessed, it would not be the abolition of the slave system, for the same persons, or others, might resume the practice. The abolition of slavery is always an act of the Government, forbidding slavery, and is, essentially, a political act. And if the non-slaveholders of the South cannot be persuaded to enlist in a "National anti-slavery party," there is less reason to expect that they will enlist in the less hopeful enterprise of State anti-slavery politics, in which they would have to meet the slaveholders without aid from the free States?

COMPROMISE—OR NO COMPROMISE?

"We seek not a revival of the Missouri Compromise, but a return to the policy inaugurated by Jefferson, of shutting slavery out of all the Federal territory by positive prohibition. Had there never been a Missouri Compromise, our position and demand would have been just what they now are. We propose no compromise, advocate none, seek none. It is very possible that, if we were offered a half-way measure, shutting slavery peremptorily out of half the federal territories, and silently leaving the other half as at present, we should not feel at liberty to reject it. But there is no such proposition now before the country; and, the Compromise being no more, we insist on the exclusion of human slavery by act of Congress from all the federal territories, present and prospective." *N. Y. Tribune, Nov. 29.*

Would there not be, virtually, a "compromise" in accepting the "half way measure" with a tacit understanding, and "silently leaving the other half as at present"? If so, the Tribune's position amounts to this. It will "seek" no compromise—will "advocate" none—will "propose" none, but it throws out an intimation, before-hand, that "possibly" it "should not feel at liberty to reject it" if offered. How much such an intimation differs from "proposing" a "compromise," we will not undertake to determine. It will probably be found to resemble the distinction between offering a bribe and giving intimations of a willingness to accept of one. All compromises with slavery we hold to be compacts with Satan, and the proposal, on his part, of such a compromise, is a satanic temptation, to be, at all times, rejected. It is by no means enough that we abstain from making advances to him, (either with or without intimations of our readiness to hear proposals from him.) We must resist all his advances, or we shall find ourselves in much the same condition as if the bargain had been proposed by us, in the first place. The main question—(so Adam found it!)—will be whether we became a party to the transaction, not whether it was, in the first place, proposed by us. The frail victim of the seducer cannot plead innocence on the ground that she made not the first advances, especially if it should appear on the record that she had thrown out previous hints, that "very possibly" she might not feel at liberty to reject proposals.

The *Tribune* has much yet to learn, if it intends to rise out of the slough of "compromises" with the Slave Power. We give it credit for having made some struggles in that direction. We remember that some two years ago, or more, it was wont to commence an Editorial with brave resolutions to have nothing

more to do with "compromises," and then wind up the same paragraph with a proposal to "rally for the restoration of the Missouri Compromise!" It even insisted that, in the then approaching Presidential struggle "the restoration of the Missouri Compromise should be the sole issue." It has now done "seeking," "advocating," or "proposing" any such thing. It waits for the proposition to come from Douglass & Co.—of which, happily, there is little prospect. The tone of the Tribune, we think, is, on the whole, improving. So long as it will continue to step forward, twelve inches at a time, even if it does, habitually, slide back, six inches, at each step, we shall continue to have hopes of it. We know it must be hard work to climb up a slippery hill side, without "radical" heel spikes.

LORD BROUGHAM AND SECRETARY MARCY.

Lord Brougham proposes to Secretary Marcy an arrangement for the mutual abolition of privateering, in time of war. Secretary Marcy, in reply, proposes that the arrangement, if made, shall extend further, and secure freedom and security, in time of war, to all neutral vessels and neutral merchandise, on the ocean, interdicting their capture and seizure, not only by privateers, but also by vessels of war. Lord Brougham, in reply, says that Mr. Marcy's course is like that of refusing to abolish the African slave trade, except on condition that the principle be extended further, for the abolition of all slavery, especially in the North American States.

This was a fair hit, as against the position of the Government of this country. Yet, it strikes us that the British Government would have done better, to have met the American Government on its own ground, and secure the abolition of privateering, by extending the principle as Mr. Marcy proposed. Lord Brougham does not appear to have denied that a proper application of the principle that would abolish privateering, would also abolish seizures by Government vessels, of neutral merchant vessels and neutral merchandise. Mr. Marcy, on his part, will not, probably, undertake to deny that the principle and the authority that abolished the African slave trade would, by an application in the direction hinted at by Lord Brougham, abolish American slavery. Both his Lordship and the Secretary, particularly the latter, appear to be aware, in some degree, of the awkward position of those who ask for important public reforms, and who are nevertheless so inconsistent as to refuse to apply, in all directions, the principle upon which the proposed reform rests.

We are glad to have such high authority for that long neglected and much derided truth.—Neglected and derided as it is, no one can watch the ever varying controversies between statesmen, diplomatists, and politicians, without witnessing the constantly recurring recognition of it, in some form, whenever the use of it is needed in self-defense. Thus the demands of Mr. Banks, and of other Republicans, on behalf of the free-State men in Kansas, is met by Governor Floyd and his partizans by criminations against the Free State men of Kansas, for having ostracised the colored man. And when State Legislatures are petitioned to extend equal political

rights to the colored man, they retort with the inquiry whether the petitioners, clergymen and church members, are prepared to allow them equal privileges in houses of worship.—Debates in Congress are continually furnishing similar illustrations. Every incident of the kind should remind abolitionists and all other reformers of the mischiefs of inconsistency, and the impolicy of attempting half-way reformations, or of allowing their chief energies to be expended in the support of half-way measures.—The almost total failure of the laws for abolishing the African slave trade, though so confidently alluded to by Lord Brougham, furnishes an instance in point. Secretary Marcy, if so disposed, might refer Lord Brougham to the proceedings of the British Parliament in 1845, in proof that the African slave trade was abolished only on paper!

"GENUINE ABOLITIONISTS."

WHO ARE THEY? HOW THE MATTER IS UNDERSTOOD IN CONGRESS.

We find, in the Congressional Globe for Dec. 8, a speech of Mr. Sherman of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, in which he speaks of "a very few, perhaps not two thousand in the whole country, who were genuine abolitionists, and believed Congress had the power, and that it is its duty to abolish slavery in the States."

In the course of his speech he was asked by Mr. Smith of Tennessee, whether he would like to see the abolition party crushed. Mr. Sherman said, "I never had any affiliation with what is known as the abolition party. I was attached to the Whig party." Mr. Smith said, "I would like a direct answer to the question. Mr. Sherman. 'If I had my voice, I would not have a single political abolitionist in the northern States. I act with the Republican party, with hundreds of thousands of others, simply because the Republican party resists the extension, but does not seek the abolition of slavery.'"

"MUST WAIT TWENTY YEARS."

Every abolitionist knows how confidently and how perpetually, for eight years past, abolitionists have been beset by Free Soilers, Free Democrats, and Republicans, with the story that it would take "twenty years' time" to change public opinion so much as to secure the election of an abolition President. And so they have been importuned to vote for Hale, Van Buren, or Fremont, because it was foolish to wait so long!

Well. Eight years of the original twenty have gone by, and thus far, Free Soilers, Free Democrats, and Republicans have had to "wait," as well as the abolitionists. Perhaps it may be thought that the large Republican vote of 1856 has changed the prospects, and that the leaders are expecting a victory in 1860. On this point we have an incident to relate, that deserves notice, and is worth remembering.

An earnest abolitionist lately met with one of the most influential and best-informed leaders of the Republican party, who, though he supported Fremont, is understood to have preferred Seward. The abolitionist said to him,

"Well, Mr. —, I suppose you are expecting to elect Seward, or some other Republican in 1860."

"No, indeed," answered Mr. —. "I fear it will take twenty years to bring public opinion up to that point."

At this rate, abolitionists are quite as well off as their more moderate friends, the Republicans, and might as well cultivate their own fields as to be "throwing away" their strength upon those of other people. More than this may be said. It is always easier to teach a *whole* truth than a *half* truth, because the former is self-consistent, and the latter is self-contradictory. One half the expense and labor that have been laid out, for eight years past, in the propagation of "non-extension" nonentities and nonsense, might have sufficed to convince the people that self-evident truths are better guides of political action than self-confuting falsehoods.

If you doubt this, try it with your children, at school. Put them under the instruction of teachers who will teach them the first half of the multiplication table, and who will then try to make them believe that ten times ten are but fifty, and that twelve times twelve are but seventy-two. Provide them with good globes and maps, and then, after they have begun to be familiar with them, try to make them believe that Long Island is larger than New Holland. Succeed in this, and then you may acquaint the people with the history of the aggressions and encroachments of slavery (in despite of our prominent statesmen, for eighty years past), and make them believe in the future success of similar efforts. Teach the people what slavery is, and then see if you can make them believe that it is to be controlled by "non-extension." Bubbles may have their day, but they must explode.

"Non-extensionists" are obliged to tell so much truth against slavery itself, that the people will infer, if they do not, that such abominations are not to be let alone where they already exist! To leave off denouncing slavery will be to leave off rousing the people against its extension. To go on denouncing slavery will be to make abolitionists. They will find themselves in the predicament of the old hen that hatched out a brood of young ducklings, and couldn't keep them out of the water.

NON-EXTENSION—ITS HISTORY—ITS LESSONS.

We must award credit to the "Republican" journals in general, and particularly to the New York Tribune, for the fidelity and industry with which, during the late canvass, they collected and disseminated information on some of the most important subjects demanding public attention at the present time.

In the first place, they gathered up and published from the journals of the past ten or twenty years, an almost incredible amount of professions, declarations, pledges, promises and resolutions from the popular politicians of the day, and their immediate partizan constituency, against the further extension of slavery, and in favor of particular measures for crippling or restricting slavery itself. They culled these from speeches in Congress, letters to constituents, answers of candidates to letters of interrogation, resolutions of local and State Conventions of political parties, resolutions of State Legislatures, legislative instructions to Senators and Representatives in Congress, letters addressed to editors, messages of State Governors, editorials of leading political journals, let-

ters from Washington correspondents of journals, &c. &c.

And these demonstrations were culled from both the great political parties, or those recently such. Sometimes the extracts from *Whig* documents and journals were piled up, till we were almost led to conceive of the late Whig party North as having been, from the beginning, one immense free soil, non-extension, and even anti-slavery organization—"the true Liberty party"—as we remember its leading journals, including the *Tribune*, claimed it to be. We cannot but confess, freely, that the tone of the Whig utterances of those days were almost indefinitely in advance of the "Republican" journals, and orators, and conventions of the present time, inasmuch as they were not confined to "non-extension," but bore heavily at the interstate slave trade, slavery in the Federal District, &c.—a feature of them to which but scanty justice is done by the "Republican" selections of which we are speaking, the present object being merely to show that the "Republican" measure of *restriction* was cherished also by the Whigs.

Sometimes, however, the selections from the *Democratic* party—its prominent statesmen, its journals, its State Legislatures, its local political conventions, and its orators, were piled up, in the "Republican" papers, till we almost began to fancy the Democratic party North, a few years since, to have been very little behind its political rival. This, too, is very pertinently and properly brought forward, to show the Democrats of 1856, (what is the fact,) that their predecessors, but a few years since, to a large extent, occupied quite as advanced a position against slavery, and slavery extension, as is now occupied by the "Republican" party, whom their leaders now arraign as disunionists and traitors.

All this is highly important. But it is not the whole. The kind of information collected and published begins not here. It goes far back of the existing era of agitation, growing out of the modern abolition movement. It goes back to the early period of our national history. The record commences with the Ordinance of 1787, or rather with the propositions of Mr. Jefferson, in that direction, which preceded it, and shows us how all or nearly all the great names of that period were identified with efforts for preventing the extension of slavery. Then comes the story of the great Missouri struggle of 1819-20, which was adjusted by the famous or rather infamous Missouri Compromise. And then follows the Texas struggle, and the proposed Wilmot proviso, introducing the struggle in which the country is now engaged. HORACE GREELEY has done the country a service by collecting the documents connected with this seventy years effort at "non-extension," and arranging and publishing them in a thick compact pamphlet, equivalent to a large volume of the ordinary type and style. And the N. Y. Tribune and other "Republican" papers dealt out select portions of the history, through their columns, from time to time.

This was well adapted, and was designed to rally the people to the rescue of Kansas, at the pending Presidential election. It points them to the example of their honored statesmen of all parties, for the last seventy years. It shows them that if they consented to the further exten-

sion of slavery, by voting for Buchanan, they were taking the back track, and reversing the policy of their political fathers. It showed them that large numbers of those who were committing themselves to that wickedness were doing so in violation of their own solemn professions and promises—against their own conscientious and rational convictions. It bade them shun such examples, and to refuse co-operation with such apostates. Thus far, the lessons wrapped up in the history were very pertinently and properly urged home upon the voters, by the Republican editors.

So far so good. We heartily thank Horace Greeley and his fellow-laborers for this service. It was an important part of the great work which needed to be done. But it strikes us that they are leaving the work incomplete. It occurs to us that there is another thread of this history that needs to be more prominently interwoven with it—that there is a deeper lesson, a still more important inference to be derived from it.

What are the facts? Side by side with this story of a seventy years' struggle against the extension of slavery, by the strongest and best statesmen of the country, there is to be placed the story of seventy years' steady extension of slavery, until it now threatens to overspread the entire nation, including, signally, the very portions supposed to have been irrevocably secured, by non-extension efforts, against it! More than this. The *whole* history, in its completeness, reveals the humiliating fact that nearly all our foremost champions of non-extension, (the earlier as well as the later ones,) outlived their "non-extension" zeal, or so far abated it, as to consent to slavery extension, and, in some instances, to become clamorous in its favor. It shows us a Washington, admitting new slave States, and re-enacting a slave code over the District of Columbia, and the city bearing his own name. It shows us a Jefferson, diverging from the principles and the policy of the Ordinance of 1787, by urging the purchase of Louisiana, in the absence, as he believed, of any Constitutional authority for the transaction; and at a later day, opposing with virulence and invective, the proposed anti-slavery restriction upon Missouri. It shows us a William Pinckney of Maryland, in the face of his own early testimonies, treading the same downward course with Jefferson, and even joining in the threat of dissolving the Union, unless slavery could have full scope! Of the more modern prominent non-extensionists we need not now speak. Not all of them are yet apostates, but of the vast majority of them, for the last fifteen years, the "Republican" papers—as already noticed, have been telling the sad tale. Could they have been transferred from the Buchanan and Fillmore camps to that of the "Republicans," the Presidential contest would have been decided at once.

Such, in its completeness, would be the true history of "non-extension" efforts, up to the present time. It is a history that should be studied with care, and in the light of those great laws of mind which control all human affairs. We are not now prepared, nor have we the room, to draw out, at full length, the lessons of practical instruction wrapped up in this history. But it presents, on the face of it, two

questions, which we hope our readers will ponder—

1. Whether, or to what extent, and on what grounds of judgment, a statesman or a political party should be trusted, to act steadily and permanently, against the *extension* of slavery, if not heartily and actively committed against the *existence* of slavery?

2. Whether, by the help of the most faithful and trustworthy statesmen, by the most patriotic and well directed political party, even in the ascendant, *it be possible* to prevent the *extension* of slavery, otherwise than by the *extinction* of slavery? Whether the latter be not the essential condition, means, and prerequisite of the former?

The past history of this country, and of other countries, examined in the light of the self-evident and fundamental truths of political science, and in an intelligent remembrance of God's moral and providential control over the nations, in harmony with man's moral nature, ought to guide us to some satisfactory and safe answers to these questions.

LESSONS FOR ABOLITIONISTS.

Extract from the *N. Y. Tribune* of Oct. 21.

"Wherever an earnest and industrious canvass has been made, on Republican principles, we have done nobly; where another element has shut Republicanism from public view, or no such canvass has been made, we have nothing to record but disaster."

Let abolitionists remember this, whenever they are tempted to co-operate with those who hold other principles. The *Tribune's* argument against a coalition of Republicans with Know-Nothings, is equally good against a coalition of abolitionists with Republicans. But, listen, further, to the *N. Y. Tribune*.

"Failure is by no means always defeat. Much as we desire the success of the Republican candidate, we should be false to every feeling which urged us to embrace his cause, if we believed that the final victory of the principle he represents could be defeated with him. And this because it is a principle for which he stands. Policy may be mortal—must be mortal, excepting it be but an embodiment of principle; but truth is eternal as God himself. It is not a sentiment, an emotion, a selfishness, that has caused the ebullition with which the general mind at the North now foams, and which we believe must yet purify it of whatever defiles and corrupts it. It was the angel of Truth that came down and stirred those waters for the healing of the nation. The virtue of that effervescence will not pass away with the touch that caused it. The sense of the inhering abominations of Slavery, which is now keener than it ever was before, will never again lose its sharpness, and the hearted purpose that they shall curse no fresh domain can never abate its edge. The present movement may fail through the folly or the blunders of its friends, but the principle which is the life of its life is as immortal as the Soul of Man."

The *Tribune* gave utterance to the above (Oct. 21) in view of the alternative of the defeat of Fremont. It answers much better for voting Radical Abolitionists, whom the *Tribune* taunts with "throwing away their votes" than it does for Republicans, who substituted expediency for principle.

One lesson more from the *Tribune*:

"It was this overweening confidence in the cowardly indifference to the rights and interests of others, as long as their own selfish rights and instant interests were safe, on the part of the North, that lured Pierce, Douglas and Atchinson to urge on the bloodhounds of Slavery to seize on the virgin soil of Kansas, and, by fiendish violence, to make it teem reluctantly with swarms of slaves."

"Cowardly indifference to the rights and in-

terests of others?" &c.—The *Tribune* did not intend to draw a picture of the party that overlooks the "rights and interests" of three and a half millions of slaves, "so long as" they supposed "white" liberty to be secure. The picture is nevertheless true, to the life.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY, 1857.

Letters for the Editor of the *Radical Abolitionist*, or for the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st. New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

TAKE NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

THE DEFEAT—HOW IT WAS ACCOMPLISHED—HOW IT MAY BE RECTIFIED.

Under this timely and appropriate head, the *Westchester Pa. Independent Herald*, among other things specifies the following:

"That the Pro-Slavery element, making up so large a portion of the sham-Democracy, has gone unanimously against the Republican party, is manifest. Although the platform of the party guaranteed the most sacred protection to the slaveholder, who had acquired his human property under the Constitution, the offers of the party were rejected. While we stoutly maintained that Kansas should be a Free State, we pledged ourselves that the institution should not be touched in the States where it had been sanctioned by law. But the South did not believe us, and, of course, went with the party that had been tried and found reliable."

And so the policy of disclaimers, and of pledges to sustain slavery in the States, amounted to nothing. Nobody, at the North or at the South, was won over to Republicanism by it.—Just as might have been expected.—Does the *Independent Herald* propose that this mistake shall be "rectified"? It does not distinctly say so. But we see no other lesson to be learned by it. If nothing was gained, much was undoubtedly lost by it.

The *Herald*, in the same article, labors to patch up, again, for future use, the alliance between the Republicans and the Know-Nothings.—It represents them as having one interest and one object.

"The Americans are in the way of the papal element. The Republicans occupy the same position" . . . "Neither the American nor the Republican has such an overplus of strength as to throw it away in senseless disputes over verbal differences," &c.

So the *Herald* is for trying "fusion" again!

WHICH IS PREFERABLE?

John Whipple, a distinguished lawyer of Rhode Island, writes, in a letter published in the *Tribune*:

"I had rather see a separation of the States than to submit to fasten another chain upon another son of man."

Excellent. But why should not Mr. Whipple and other Republicans, also rather see a separation of the States, than aid to hold the chains on any son of man now wearing them? Can they tell?—*True American*.

One question further. Why should not Mr. Whipple—the *True American*, and every body else, prefer to ABOLISH SLAVERY—an easier task than separating the States—rather than divide the Union, a measure by means of which the slaveholders are now seeking both to extend and to perpetuate slavery?

STREAKS OF DAYLIGHT.

The very platform now presented to *The Herald* by THE *TRIBUNE*, as the embodiment of *Tribunitial* wisdom is so absurdly drawn that in one paragraph it says that "Congress has sovereign power over the Territories," and in the next it says: "We deny the authority of Congress to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States." Which of these two statements contains "THE *TRIBUNE's* sentiments exactly?"—*Herald*.

Answer.—Both of them. We hold that Congress has sovereign legislative power over the Territories, just as our legislature has over this State; but sovereign power is not arbitrary, despotic, unlimited power; and our legislature has no power to establish slavery in this State, nor has Congress such power in the Territories.

Some people profess to see in the asserted power of Congress to prohibit slavery a like power to admit or legalize it; but that does not follow. Our Legislature has power to forbid and punish murder; it has no rightful power to shield and reward murder. In short, there is a "higher law," as *The Herald* will yet discern. Of that law, human legislation should be, but often is not, a true reflection.—*N. Y. Tribune*.

We congratulate the *Tribune* on the discovery that "Sovereign power is not arbitrary, despotic, unlimited power"—such as the power to "give legal existence to slavery."

Grant us but this, and the entire doctrine of "Radical Abolitionists" stands firm. The principle, affirmed by the *Tribune*, if true at all, is as true in respect to State Governments, as it is in respect to the National Government. "State Sovereignty," then, does not include any such right as that of maintaining slavery. "State Rights" do not include the prerogative. And consequently, a National Abolition of slavery would be no invasion of "State Sovereignty" or of "State Rights."

Perhaps this is no new discovery of the *Tribune*, for the *Tribune* endorsed Gen. Granger's speech. We hope to see the time when the *Tribune's* political platform will harmonize with its "higher law" principles. Then its power will be quadrupled.

If "our Legislature has no power to establish slavery in this State"—how could the legislature of Virginia have had power to establish it in Virginia?

PROGRESS OF LIGHT.

Putnam's Monthly for December contains an elaborate article on "the late Election," which is, in some respects, a very interesting one.—The writer denies that the little knot of slaveholders constitute "the South," or that slavery is an "institution" of the southern States. It is simply a custom, a practice, prevailing among a portion of the inhabitants—a "usage of society, which the laws permit, and to a small extent regulate." "Houses of pleasure in France, are regulated by law; but they are not an institution of the State of France."—"Lotteries are sanctioned by law, in some States, but lotteries are not State institutions."—"The legislature is an institution of the State, designed to enact laws"—"the courts of justice are institutions of the State, designed to interpret laws and declare penalties. But slavery is not of the nature of any of these. The writer proceeds—

"In giving themselves out as the 'Southern States' the slaveholders commit the same mistake which has been made by aspiring classes in all ages, and if they do not refrain, they must encounter the same destiny. The old priesthood of Rome proclaimed that 'we are the Church,' but the Reformation in Germany demonstrated that the congregation is the Church. Louis the Fourteenth said 'I am the State,' but the descendants of Louis, in the

experiences of 1789, discovered that the people had something to say about that. In the same way, the slaveholders desire to say 'we are the South, we are the Southern States,' but let them beware of the end."

This view is decidedly indicative of progress. When politicians—when even professed abolitionists can learn to use, understandingly, this language, and to keep in mind the great fact indicated by it, they will be prepared to take new positions, and construct better platforms, and advocate improved measures. In uniting to resist pro-slavery aggressions, they will not deem it needful to disclaim any intentions of "interfering" with "Southern institutions." In operating against slavery they will neither be restrained by idle fears of encroaching upon "State sovereignty" nor impelled to advocate a "separation from the South" with its ten millions of inhabitants, (three-fourths of them desirous of freedom,) in order to avoid extending support and fraternity to the two or three hundred thousand slaveholders, who now oppress them.

On the subject of the Constitution, too, the writer begins to "see men as trees walking."—He says—

"It refers to 'persons held to service' and to certain 'inhabitants not free' i. e. *not politically citizens*, but nowhere refers to slaves, *as such*, nor to any class of men as property. How could it, without stultifying and annulling itself? How could the framers of that instrument, who were no fools, who understood the force of logic, legislate for men as men in one clause, and for men as property in another, when property and manhood are two fundamentally opposite ideas?"

Surely! And how could they stultify themselves by "recognizing peculiar relations" (relations of owners and property) "subsisting between the inhabitants of certain States in the Union"? Yet the writer seems to concede this. Into this error he was probably led by his still retaining the old assumption (now exploded as fictitious) that Southern slavery exists in virtue of "local, positive, municipal law"—whereas it is now conceded by the slaveholders themselves, that there is no such law in existence! The writer, if we rightly understand him, has only to correct this mistake, and to shape his logical deductions accordingly, in order to come up, fully, to the ground of radical abolitionists, in respect to the proper construction of the Federal Constitution.

THE NATIONAL ERA vs. REVERDY JOHNSON.

In the case of Dred Scott, before the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Reverdy Johnson said—

"It (the Constitution) maintains, throughout, that man can hold property in man."

The National Era denies this, and quotes Mr. Madison's testimony concerning the Federal Convention, that it deliberately framed the Constitution in such a manner as to *preclude* that idea. Mr. Madison, himself, "would not consent that the Constitution should tolerate that idea."

The National Era is very correct in this, and we are glad to see it taking the right ground, thus far. But has the Era considered the full scope and results of its own statement? If the Constitution carefully excludes the idea of "property in man"—then it carefully excludes the ideas of slavery and of slaves. If it does this, then no circumlocutions in that instrument, are to be construed as recognitions of

slavery, or as referring to slaves, for this would be to subvert the Constitution, and to defeat the careful exclusion by the Convention, of the idea of "property in man"—since slaves are held as "property," and are held by no other claim or tenure.

There are, therefore, no "compromises of the Constitution" on the slavery question,—the "idea" of slavery being altogether excluded. And, this being the case, it follows that there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent the Federal Government from giving full and universal effect to all the clauses of the Constitution that protect personal liberty. As the Constitution knows nothing of color, knows nothing of slaves, knows nothing of slavery, there is nothing to prevent the application of the "habeas corpus," and of the "due process of law," to secure the liberties of every human being in the country. The authority and duty of the Federal Government "to secure the blessings of liberty" to "the people of the United States," are as plain and as undeniable as language could make it. The limitations of Federal power cannot preclude it from carrying out the declared objects of the Constitution. Nor are there any "State Rights" to maintain slavery under a Constitution that recognises "no rights of property in man"—a Constitution framed to "secure the blessings of liberty." The statement of the National Era covers the whole question, and decides it in favor of freedom.—There is no escape from this, but by taking shelter under the wing of Mr. Reverdy Johnson.

A REMARKABLE FUSION.—The Boston Daily Chronicle, which was established as the organ of Rum interest in Massachusetts, and the Boston Daily Telegraph, which was established to advocate the Maine Law, are about to fuse and become one paper, as the advocate of Republicanism. [N. Y. Times.]

"Remarkable?" Why so? If the "Republican" maw is greedy and capacious enough to swallow down and accommodate pro-slavery and anti-slavery—Bennett's N. Y. Herald and the Free Presbyterian—Henry J. Raymond and Frederick Douglass—Francis P. Blair and Samuel J. May—why shouldn't it take in Rumocracy and Maine Law, and digest them into one common mass, for its nutriment?—"Variety is the spice of life," and why shouldn't it be the life, and spice too, of "available" politics? Bank and Anti Bank, Free Trade and Protective Tariff, Pro-slavery and Anti-slavery, kept the Whig party alive for many years, and gave it four Presidents. Who knows what the "Republican" party, under the same managers, may do? Already there are indications of an effort to keep the Republican party alive, by "fusing" more thoroughly with the Know Nothings and the Tariff men.

KOSSUTH ON AMERICAN SLAVEHOLDERS.

Kossuth has delivered a lecture to the working classes in Edinburg, in which he says—

"A principle that does not extend itself is doomed to wither, like a sapless tree. The

* The Era justly says—"How the Legislature of the Southern States regards slaves, is immaterial—that legislation is no rule to determine the construction of the Federal Constitution."

despots of the continent perfectly understand the truth, and have succeeded but too well in carrying it out. The American slaveholders with their oligarchy of color—the *worst of all oligarchies*—understand it, and are ready to risk life, fortune, and even the existence of the American union, for the extension of their execrable system. Principles, good or bad, can subsist only by extension."—*Vide N. Y. Times, Dec. 29.*

IS NOTHING TO BE LEARNED FROM EXPERIENCE?

In 1847 the great majority of political abolitionists were persuaded to quit the Liberty party and go into the Free Soil party, which first nominated John P. Hale, but which dropped him in 1848 for Van Buren. Very few, if any of them, who now survive, and who have not gone over, neck and heels, into the pro-slavery party, will hesitate to acknowledge that they made a lamentable mistake in voting for Van Buren. Nearly all of them who maintain any professions of abolitionism, will say that they lament the general desertion of the old Liberty party.

In 1852 the Free Soil party, or rather, the Free Democracy, nominated John P. Hale, and voted for him. Shortly after, in view of the reduced vote of that party, as compared with that of the Free Soil party, in 1848, its principal founder told us, frankly, that he regretted that he and his associates ever left the Liberty party.

In 1856, the surviving forces of the Free Democracy, and Free Soil parties, *instead of coming back into the Liberty party*, ran into the Republican party, on a narrower issue and a lower platform than either of the preceding ones. It needs no seer to predict that such of them as retain any predilections for liberty will, in a few years, if not in a few months, be just as heartily sick of their recent expedient, as they now are of their former ones. And then, they will probably be just as eager to run after the next half-way movement, again, as if they had not thrice tested and proved the folly of such experiments.

PRECEDENTS ESTABLISHED BY THE SLAVERY PARTY, IF THEY SUCCEED.—The Slavery party insists that our fathers were mistaken, in their construction of the Constitution, when they restricted slavery by the Missouri Compromise, and by the Ordinance of 1787, renewed in 1789.

Then we are not bound by the Constitutional constructions of our fathers, but are at liberty to construe the paper as it *reads*! The doctrine of being bound by the "understandings" and "intentions" of the fathers, is given to the winds! Very good. Abolitionists will bear this in mind, when they come into power.

The Slavery party insist that the States are equal. Very good. Abolitionists will remember this, when they come into power; and in the use of *their* right to construe the Constitution, will prohibit slavery in *all* the States, as our fathers prohibited it in Ohio, &c.

If slavery is to be established in Kansas by the interference of the Federal Government, then freedom may be established in the States by the same authority.

NATIONAL ABOLITION A NATIONAL NECESSITY.

The present condition of the South not only furnishes a conclusive answer to the oft repeated inquiry—"What has the North to do with slavery?"—but incontestibly proves that a National Abolition of American Slavery is not only a National duty, but a National necessity. In fifteen of our thirty-one States, the inhabitants are constantly exposed to all the horrors that must, of necessity, result, from a general uprising of the slaves; the entire community in those States, are exposed to all the terrors and more dreadful realities of a sanguinary domestic conflict, and the General Government is, at any moment, liable to be called upon to afford protection and security to the slaveholders—which, in the popular estimation, can only be done by an indiscriminate slaughter of the blacks, including, probably, a large portion of the poorer non-slaveholding whites of the South. Such a process is liable to cost the nation millions of treasure, and the blood of scores of thousands of citizens. It is liable to cost national dismemberment and national ruin. And it must be a contest for the forcible support and indefinite continuance of the slave system—a war in favor of the oppressors, against the oppressed! "The Almighty has no attribute," says Jefferson, "which could take sides with us, in such a contest." And yet no National Administration not in the hands of "Radical Abolitionists" would hesitate, for one moment, to plunge the country, its best blood and treasure, into just such a contest, the very moment the occasion should present itself! And if we may depend upon slaveholding testimony for any thing, not only "the South," but the Nation, is, at this moment, upon the trembling brink of the crater of just such a volcano, ready at any time, to break forth. No intelligent and reflecting citizen ought to be surprised, on any day in the year, or at any hour in the day or night, at a telegraphic announcement of the long deferred but constantly approaching catastrophe.

In view of such an astounding fact, what excuse can there be for apathy or inaction, on the part of the nation, in respect to our great National sin, our great National danger? No principle is better established or more indisputable than that which connects common liabilities and dangers with common rights of precaution and security against them. What would be thought of the pretence that a portion, larger or smaller, of the citizens of a great and populous city, have a sovereign independent right to carry on the powder making business in the heart of the city, and of piling up heaps of powder to any extent they please, without any interference from their fellow citizens, or from their municipal authorities! The comparison is altogether too feeble an one to illustrate the case of 347,000 slaveholders, and four millions of slaves, in a nation of Twenty-Four Millions of inhabitants. The thought is not to be entertained, for a moment, that the nation is under the slightest moral or political obligation to tolerate such a condition of things for a single week, or that it can safely or innocently do so. There is no national duty, there is no national necessity, pressing so heavily upon this nation, at this moment, as a national abolition of slavery.

John Quincy Adams declared on the floor of Congress that, under the war power, Congress had the right, in certain contingencies, to abolish slavery in the States. No contingency arising out of a foreign war could be so pressing as that arising out of a domestic servile war. The contingency specified by John Quincy Adams will have been more than realized, with the first tap of the drum that announces the commencement of a servile war. Why then should we madly wait for the actual realization of a catastrophe which every considerate and sane man anticipates, with as confident an expectation as he does the next solar eclipse, only with the frightful disadvantage of not being able to "know the day or the hour"? Why not, at once, put an end to such an "extra hazardous" state of things, and secure the nation from its imminent perils?

FOREIGN SLAVE TRADE.

Our readers are already apprized of the action of Congress on this subject, but we deem it proper to record the particulars for future reference.

In the House of Representatives, Dec. 15th, Mr. Etheridge of Tennessee, submitted the following resolution—

"Resolved, That this House of Representatives regard all suggestions and propositions of every kind, by whomsoever made, for a revival of the African slave trade, as shocking to the moral sentiment of the enlightened portion of mankind; and that any act on the part of Congress conniving at or legalizing that horrid and inhuman traffic, would justly subject the Government and citizens of the United States to the reproach and execration of all civilized and Christian people throughout the world."

Mr. Orr of South Carolina, offered a substitute, as below, but the vote was taken on the above Resolution of Mr. Etheridge, and adopted by—yeas 152, nays 57.

Mr. Orr then presented his Resolution, as follows—

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient, unwise, and contrary to the settled policy of the United States, to repeal the laws prohibiting the African slave trade."

Resolution adopted by Yeas 181, Nays 10.

NAYS—Messrs. Barclay (Penn.) Barkdale, (Miss.) Hendley S. Bennett, (Miss.) Brooks (S. C.) Crawford (Geo.) Day (Ohio) Garnett, (Va.) Quitman, (Miss.) Shorter (Ala.) and Walker, (Ala.)

Two of the above, viz. Messrs. Barclay of Penn., and Day of Ohio, had voted for the stronger Resolution of Mr. Etheridge, leaving only eight members who did not, in some form, vote against renewing the African slave trade, and these eight were from slave States.

Mr. Etheridge's Resolution strikes beyond the African slave trade. It condemns the American slave trade, and the practice of slaveholding with which it is identified.

By many, this will be regarded as a final abandonment of the project. But it should be remembered that the annexation of Texas was, at one time, seemingly abandoned, and when the excitement had subsided, the measure was brought forward again. The N. Y. Independent, a journal by no means extravagantly radical, does not believe that the project of reopening the slave trade is abandoned. Neither

does the Wisconsin Democrat, from which we copy the following—

"Some of the Republican papers are rejoicing that only fifty-seven Democrats, being two-thirds of the members of that party, voted against branding the African slave trade as piracy. For our own part, we consider this vote a victory of the southern fire-eaters—for up to the present time, since the prohibition of the slave traffic, no fifty-seven Democrats could be found, with sufficient infernal courage, to defy the moral sentiment of the civilized world. Three members from the non-slaveholding States also voted with the slaveholders. Herbert, the murderer, and Denver, his colleague from California, and Mr. Florence from Philadelphia. This vote, sustained as it is, by a majority of all the Southern members, is very encouraging to those who commenced the agitation only a few years since. Few new and startling theories have gained power so quickly as the advocacy in favor of opening the African slave trade, among the slaveholders. This will not be the last attempt looking towards the same end."

ABOLITIONISM IN PENNSYLVANIA.—Though the following notice is not in season for its original object, we publish it, as an indication that abolitionism has not died out in Pennsylvania.

"The Radical Abolitionists of Warren Co., we are glad to learn, have called a County Convention to be held at Sugar Grove, Jan. 13th, at 1 o'clock, P. M., continuing afternoon and evening. It is for the purpose of better organization, consultation, and the appointment of delegates to attend the proposed National Convention of the party, in June next. Revs. W. D. Henry and T. Burrows, James Catlin, Lewis Clarke, and others, will address the Convention. The Convention will be an important one, and we await its action with interest."

[True Amer.]

NATIONAL CONVENTION.

TO RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS.

Each one of you to whom this paper shall come, or to whom it may be shown, will please to consider the following CIRCULAR, as a letter addressed to yourself, personally, by name, and will please to answer it accordingly.

CIRCULAR.

NEW YORK, Jan. 1, 1857.

Mr. _____
SIR,—A number of earnest Radical Abolitionists (Gerrit Smith and others) have suggested the importance of holding a National Convention of Radical Abolitionists, as early as convenient the present year, to take counsel, to devise, to plan, to organize, to provide means, and lay out the work for extended and vigorous operations, and among other things, and especially, to consider and decide whether it is best to make, forthwith, a Presidential Nomination for 1860, or whether it is best to take previous measures of preparation, by the diffusion of light, for a nominating convention at an early day. Inasmuch as there are differences of opinion respecting such a Convention, at so early a period, it has been thought best to invite those who are in favor of it, and who will pledge themselves to attend it, to sign the paper annexed, procure other signatures to the same, and return it previous to the 1st of March next. Such a Convention, when held, ought to be attended by THOUSANDS, and from at least all the free States. Yet if FIVE HUNDRED NAMES, from nearly all of those states, shall be seasonably signed, as above, to said pledge, the call will then be issued.

Answers should be addressed to Wm. Goodell, Box 1212, 48 Beekman St. N. York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Committee.

The day of the month will be determined upon, and inserted in the call, if issued.

PLEDGE.

The undersigned, believing in the Constitutional duty of the American people and Government to abolish American slavery, do hereby agree and pledge ourselves to attend a National Convention at Rochester, N. Y. on Wednesday and Thursday, June 10th & 11th, 1857, for the promotion of that object; and particularly to act on the question whether a Presidential Nomination for 1860 be forthwith made, or whether it be deferred to some time to be then determined upon.—And we authorise the appending of our names to a Call for such a Convention.

Name.	State and P. O. Address.
-------	--------------------------

NEW YORK CENTRAL COLLEGE.—We have received a pamphlet, containing an account of the "origin, design, and operation of the New York Central College," at McGrawville. It was founded on the idea that "humanity lies at the foundation of all human associations"—that education is for all men, irrespective of race or complexion, that caste and aristocracy are especially out of place in institutions designed to facilitate human culture, that the education of women is as important as the education of men, that the proper business of a College is to develop the mental faculties, not to build up a particular sect. The Bible is regarded as "a classic, and a Text Book." The instructors are to be "persons of good Christian character," and physical labor is cherished as honorable, and not degrading. The College is in need of funds, and we heartily commend it to the support of the friends of freedom.

MICHIGAN UNION COLLEGE, LEONI, MICH.—We have received a catalogue of this institution, for the year ending June 18, 1856.—Total number of students 323.—This College is, we believe, under patronage of Wesleyans, Congregationalists, and others, who sympathise with the cause of human freedom. The names of Luther Lee, Cyrus Prindle, and other abolitionists, on its Board of Trustees, assures us of its freedom from the spirit of caste. The name of LORENZO HAND, A. M., stands at its head, as President, though we see, from the papers, that Rev. ASA MAHAN, formerly of Oberlin, is invited to its Presidency. The Trustees are making an effort for the endowment of the Faculty—an enterprise deserving encouragement.

NEW POSTAGE LAW.—By the new law, the postage on books, pamphlets, and tracts must be prepaid.—Those who send for them must accordingly send money enough to pay for the publications and the postage.

NEW PUBLICATION.

We add to our "special list" and general catalogue, the following:

"THE KANSAS STRUGGLE OF 1856, in Congress and in the Presidential Campaign, with suggestions for the future." New York: American Abolition Society, 48 Beekman Street, 1857. pp. 80. Price 12 cents—postage, 4 cents.

CONTENTS.—Condition of Kansas—Proceed-

ings in Congress—Proposed enslavement of the whites—Pro-slavery theories of the Government—Nebraska Bill—Virginia, vs. New York—State Equality—Cincinnati Platform—The Democratic Argument—What was meant by the Platform—Extent of the pro-slavery claim—How has it been met?—Position of the Republican Party—Previous Experiments—Lessons of Experience, Non Extension a failure—Presidential Election—Causes of Republican defeat—What would have been gained by a Republican Victory?—The True Course—Principles of Government—National Responsibilities—The Constitution—Duties, Alternatives, Necessities—Temptations—Abolition Pledge—Its Uses—A National Abolition Party.

This pamphlet has been prepared with great labor, and it is hoped that its circulation may do something towards shaping the measures of the opponents of slavery, for the future.

A FREE PRESS IN A SLAVE STATE!

The "KENTUCKY NEWS," by W. S. Bailey, Newport, Ky., is published, both as a Daily and a Weekly. Newport is on the Ohio River, nearly opposite Cincinnati. The Weekly, now before us, is a paper of good size, and is "published at \$1 a year, always in advance." It has the rare merit of being an anti-slavery paper published in a slave state, and receiving a very respectable home circulation. Such a paper, at such a crisis, is a phenomenon demanding attention, and its publication is an enterprise deserving general patronage. "The North" as well as "the South" should give the paper a wide circulation. Mr. Bailey is a hero of manly daring and unrelaxing endurance. He established his paper in March, 1850, determined that there should be one free press in a slave state. He has been mobbed and "burnt-out" by pro-slavery "incendiaries" and persecuted in various ways, and has thus lost over ten thousand dollars, but is struggling on still. Both in his "Daily" and in his "Weekly" he keeps up a brisk fire against slavery, and by a miracle (almost) of labor and economy, has managed to keep his paper alive. He has a large family to support, but they too, in the same spirit, take hold with him and help him. His type setting is mostly done by his daughters, and it is by that assistance, chiefly, we believe, that he manages to keep his press going. There is the "dignity of labor" for you, and "the proper sphere of woman," too. And this example comes from a slave State! Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, along with her dark pictures of southern society, has intermingled many bright examples, which would do honor to the people of any country under heaven. We are glad that she has done so, for we would not have the anti-slavery movement degenerate into a miserable Pharisaical boasting of "the North" over "the South." But "truth is stranger than fiction," and we doubt whether, among all the southern heroes and heroines of freedom imagined by Mrs. Stowe, there are any whose doings and endurings are more deserving of immortal remembrance than those of "the Bailey family of Ky." Before she settles the plan or the title of another southern tale, we hope Mrs. Stowe will become well acquainted with "THE BAILEY FAMILY," and see what might be made out of them. In the mean time, and without waiting for the excitements or the amusements of Mrs.

Stowe's pen, we hope the friends of liberty in the free states will extend a liberal patronage to the "Kentucky News."

And this is not all we have to say. Mr. Bailey's losses have reduced him to poverty, and his whole family as well as his noble enterprise are in pressing need of immediate help. We have been sending "help for Kansas," and that is well. Now let there be "HELP FOR KENTUCKY." And let the help be prompt and liberal.

In a "circular" sent to his friends, Mr. Bailey says he wishes to raise \$3,500 to redeem his house and lot, which have been sold to pay his debts. He also wants \$1,200 for new type, &c., &c. He says:—

"Here is the place to proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof, and here is the place to plant the bulwark of redemption to the oppressed. The non-slaveholders of Kentucky and of the whole south have rights, as well as the free men of the north, and to be elevated, respected, and prosperous, must maintain them. The north rejects the institution of slavery upon free soil as an engine of torture and oppression to both black and white, and we claim the same right, upon the same grounds, to reject it here, and shall implore their aid and sympathy in assisting us to do so!"

What Northern free man or free woman can reject such an appeal? It is comparatively easy to oppose slavery on northern free soil. We have been tauntingly asked "why don't you go to the south" to preach abolition? Come then, let us "go to the south" by our contributions to a southern free press. THE BAILEY FAMILY are already "at the South." Let them be sustained there.

Do you ask for testimonials? Read the following from CASSIUS M. CLAY.

To all to whom these presents shall come—Wm. S. Bailey of the Newport News, Newport, Ky., has made great pecuniary sacrifices in the cause of our common liberties, and is still making sacrifices. His paper, Daily and Weekly, is doing good service in Kentucky, and encouraging all in the slave states to do the same. All the friends of the Republican cause would do well to aid him, as a little money from each one would place his paper on a permanent basis of stability and usefulness. C. M. CLAY.

What Mr. Clay says to "Republicans" we say to "Abolitionists." Here is common ground for co-operation—HELP FOR KENTUCKY! A FREE PRESS IN KENTUCKY!

HERALD OF FREEDOM, by G. W. Brown & Co., Lawrence, Kansas.—This publication is resumed, with great energy, spirit, and liveliness. We have received several numbers, and hope to miss none of them. It takes a hopeful view of things. Whenever we feel tempted to "get the blues" concerning Kansas, or concerning the interests of freedom in general, we hunt up a copy of the Herald of Freedom, and read ourselves into good spirits again. The editor may be a little too sanguine. But leaving a wide margin for this, there remains room for a cheerful hope concerning Kansas, in despite of all the powers of darkness against it, and all the mistakes of the "friends of Kansas" not much in its favor. Free labor, free speech, and a free press work wonders. Here lies the hope of Kansas, after all, so far as human instrumentalities are concerned, saying nothing to the disparagement of votes—even Fremont votes—and Sharp's

rifles. We can't help feeling this, when we read Brown's stirring Herald. It is a record of facts, but not a *dry* record. Whoever would become acquainted with Kansas should *subscribe*, (as we have done, though an editor) for the Herald of Freedom. "Terms two dollars per annum in advance."

VOTING ON PRINCIPLE. LETTER OF SAMUEL MCFARLAND.—We have now in the press, to be issued in a few days, the Letter of Samuel McFarland, which appeared in the Radical Abolitionist for January. Price two cents per copy, or \$1.50 per hundred. Postage one cent.

THE POLITICAL ABOLITIONIST. By A. W. Hunter. Bryan, Williams county, Ohio.

This able paper is now enlarged, and continues to be published weekly, at two dollars per annum. We wish it a large circulation. It advocates the doctrines of Radical Abolitionists, with spirit and decision.

"THE WESTERN PRESAGE."—This is a new weekly paper, of ample size, and beautiful appearance, by Bidwell Brothers, Indianapolis, Ind. Terms in advance \$2, five copies \$9, ten copies \$15. No 1, for January 3d, is before us. We hope to receive it regularly hereafter. If we mistake not, "the Western Presage" is a "presage" of a new era of abolition enterprise in the West, particularly in Indiana. The publishers, if we rightly understand them, will confine themselves to no narrow platform, nor restrict their sheet to the rules laid down by the managers of a party. Success to them, we say, and from the tone and spirit of the first number we have no doubt that they *will* succeed.

THE PROPOSED NATIONAL CONVENTION.

We republish the Circular inviting signatures to the Call for a National Abolition Convention.

It will be noticed that the blank is filled with *Wednesday and Thursday, the 10th and 11th of June*. Those who intend signing it, and procuring signatures to it, should lose no time, and be prompt in making returns by the first of March.

Remember. The success of the measure will depend, vitally, upon the number of names seasonably forwarded, as pledged to attend.

FUNDS FOR THE ABOLITION SOC'Y.

Funds come in, scantily and tardily. If abolitionists intend to have any thing done for diffusing information respecting their principles and their measures, they must *furnish the funds*.

The following, from one of the ablest Republican Journals, fully corroborates our own strictures upon the course of the Republican members in Congress.—The tone of the article is, on the whole, an encouraging presage for the future. But we must protest against the idea that "issues" are to be shaped mainly by future contingencies. So long as slavery exists, the main "issue" is THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, and nothing else must turn it aside.

From the Boston Chronicle.

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MEANS TO DO.

Ever since Congress assembled, it has been the aim of the slaveholding members to place the Republicans on the defensive. And in this purpose they have but too well succeeded. We

have read the speeches made in the Senate and House, and with a few exceptions they are nothing but a series of excuses and apologies. Some brazen-faced slaveholder, like Butler or Mason, or some ignorant doughface like Bigler or Pugh, rises and charges the Republicans with being in favor of the dissolution of the Union, or with being in favor of abolishing slavery in the States. And forthwith there is a rush of Republicans for the floor, to say that this is all a mistake; that it is the Garrisonians alone who want to dissolve the Union, and the Gerrit Smith and Lysander Spooner class of abolitionists who hold that the Government has the power to abolish slavery in the States. The purpose of the slaveholder is answered; an apology is procured, or something in an apologetic tone, and the attacks upon the North are therefore resumed in still fiercer style. Who ever knew the slaveholders to be conciliated by these apologies or excuses? Who ever knew them to cease from their attacks, in consequence? Nobody. We commend to our friends in the Senate and House a prudent husbandry of their excuses, until they are needed. The *people* do not ask that their Senators and Representatives shall be continually explaining their position. There is no need of explanation. The purpose of the Republican party was set forth with sufficient plainness in the Philadelphia Platform, and in Colonel Fremont's letter, and no man has any right to add to or take from them anything. The platform and the letters did not pretend to exact uniformity of opinion upon minor points, but only to state the general purposes of the party, for the time being. It is entirely competent, we take it, for Republicans, during the next four years, to discuss the policy of dissolution, or the doctrine of Lysander Spooner, and for as many of them as consent to these doctrines, to adopt them. It is idle to suppose that the Republican Party of 1856 attained the perfection of wisdom on the Anti-Slavery question, or that the Republican Party of 1860 will do so. The contest of 1856 has been fought upon one issue. That issue may be the best for 1860, or it may not. Events may bring up other issues. Discussion may bring new light. Let each contest take care of itself. The purpose of the Republican Party is best stated, by Mr. Sumner, in the formula, "Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy." How to do that, is a matter of fair discussion, year by year. Let us have as few apologies as possible for the past, and no more pledges than are necessary for the future.

A P P E A L

OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

To the Abolitionists of the United States:

Fellow laborers—The Presidential Contest is over. Again the Slave Power has triumphed. Again, as heretofore, the policy of mere restriction, while ignoring, rejecting, or postponing the claims of *abolition*, has failed of its object. Is there not a Providential retribution in this very natural result? "Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, but shall not be heard." What nation ever tolerated oppression, without becoming its victim? What right have we to expect security and liberty for the *white* man, while we neglect to demand and to secure liberty for the *colored* man? Or why should we imagine that those who consent to the enslavement of the colored people, may not be induced to yield up the liberties of white people? "Till America comes into this measure," (said John Jay in 1780,) "our prayers to heaven will be impious. This is a strong expression, but it is just. . . . I believe God governs the world, and I believe it to be a maxim in His, as in our Court,

that those who ask for equity ought to do it." (*Letter from Spain*.) Can we expect, by any efforts of ours, to secure liberty for Kansas, or for *any* part of the Nation, so long as we consent that the Nation shall protect slavery in the other parts of the Nation, and that it shall stand ready to repress the efforts of colored men who, like our brethren in Kansas, resolve to be free? "The Almighty," (said Jefferson) "has no attribute which could take sides with us in such a contest." (*Notes on Virginia*.) Can we secure liberty for our country, or for any part of it, without enlisting on our side, the attributes of the Almighty? And how shall we do this, unless we urge His demand upon the Nation and its Government, that they "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof?"

Will you not join with us in urging this demand upon all our fellow-citizens? We address you, on behalf of the "American Abolition Society," and its Executive Committee, who are laboring to concentrate the contributions and the exertions of abolitionists for this object.

Our Annual Report, in the "Radical Abolitionist" for December, will more minutely inform you of what we have done, are doing, and are striving to do. We publish a monthly paper, books, pamphlets, and tracts, and keep a Depository of the same, and of other anti-slavery works,—with an Office for business. We employ lecturers, hold conventions, and variously use the press. We gratuitously furnish members of Congress and others with important documents, and promote the circulation of abolition petitions. In these and other appropriate ways, we incur large expenses, which must be promptly paid. Were it merely to sustain and to continue these efforts, we should be compelled to ask for your steady and punctual contributions. But we ask more than this. It is vastly important, at this juncture, to enlarge, greatly, our operations, at a corresponding increase of expenditure. We wish to present the claims of the slave, to the best advantage, to churches and ministers of religion, to lawyers, civilians, jurists, and statesmen. We would engage the sympathies and influence of woman. We would especially enlist the young men of the country. Portions of the South are now accessible, and present a most important field. Our distinctive views receive marked favor, *wherever they are understood*. "The common people hear them gladly."

WE WANT FUNDS commensurate with the magnitude of the enterprise, (and proportionate to the interests involved. *Is Liberty worth preserving? And how much is it worth? How much will you contribute for its preservation? By what other measures, without abolition, can it be preserved?*

Monthly subscriptions are desired.—Local clubs or societies should be formed for the purpose. Monies may be remitted to Arthur Tappan, addressed to him at 48 Beekman street, New York, where the Society's Office and Depository are kept, and the Radical Abolitionist published.

In behalf and by order of the Executive Com.

LEWIS TAPPAN,
WM. GOODELL,
S. S. JOCELYN, Sub-Com.

Editors please copy.